

As I understand it, the proposed rule changes allow the major media conglomerates to buy out more of the few remaining independent broadcasters. I fail to see who benefits from this. I'll ignore TV for the moment as that is already homogenous and unwatchable for the most part; the damage is already done.

Radio networks owned by the conglomerates too are bland beyond description and seem to me to be a vehicle to transmit advertising to those who are disinterested enough to listen to more homogenous programming content. There remain a handful of independent broadcasters out there who are prepared to take risks or program new music. Are these few to be swallowed up by the Viacom or Clear Channels of the world and made exactly like every other US radio station (and therefore not worth listening to)?

Again, I don't see who benefits. Certainly not me, a music fan and occasional musician, who will have no source to hear something new and adventurous. Not musicians, who will have no outlet unless they play what advertisers think consumers want to hear (which is often not what consumers really want to hear - witness the inability of these same media companies to 'manufacture' a lasting successful act). The media companies themselves (and their shareholders) are likely to suffer in all but the short term, as consumers will surely get fed up with the lack of choice. The only people who may benefit are those who can extract a few bucks by selling their franchise.

I strongly oppose the Amendment.